

quality funds to allow the CMAQ money, this type of money the Federal Government allows, to be used for capacity expansion projects.

The Democrats claim that this legislation is about climate change, and really, the leading causes of greenhouse gas emissions, as I said, is traffic and, actually, congestion.

Addressing the problem of congestion, if we'd done that, we would really be doing much more for a solution to reduce emissions and improve our air quality. That was turned down by the other side. I could give you a lot of statistics, and I'll include them in the RECORD of what it would do. So the Democrats rejected this effort.

Let's look at another Republican recommendation. SAM GRAVES, an outstanding representative from Missouri and one of the ranking members, offered an amendment in committee, and it was included in the Republican alternative, to streamline the pipeline permitting process to allow just for repairs, and it was rejected. This is getting some of the fossil fuel on a temporary basis to where it needs to go and also for gas and other substances that make us less dependent on the fossil fuels that cause pollution.

And finally, the Republicans offered an alternative that the Democrats refused to make in order that identify deepwater ports that we can use for L&G facilities to bring in liquefied natural gas on an expedited basis when it's in the national interest. So, again, we become less reliant on the types of fossil fuels that pollute and cause global warming.

So we attempted to work with the other side for real solutions that we could have put in in addressing the problems that transportation contributes again to global warming and these bad emissions in our atmosphere were rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to my good friend from Florida about our committee markup on this legislation, and I do think that a correction to the record is in order.

The Drake amendment would have amended the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program to allow construction of new single-occupancy vehicle lanes. That hardly contributes to energy conservation. CMAQ is intended for high-occupancy vehicle lanes. Ninety-eight percent of the STP and NHS programs can be used for single-occupancy vehicle lanes. CMAQ, since ISTEA in 1991, has been an energy conservation and air quality improvement program. That amendment would have set us back rather than moved us forward.

The L&G provision the gentleman referenced, the amendment was directed at a provision in the existing safety law legislation in the State of Massachusetts, one which the entire Massachusetts delegation supported in

2005, and the existing law and this provision would have overturned or significantly amended that language and was vigorously opposed by the entire Massachusetts delegation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided energy bill, or the "energy without half the lights on" bill.

There's a saying in West Virginia that coal keeps the lights on, but H.R. 3321 effectively turns off the lights on the country's energy supply. It's important to our economy, to family budgets, and to businesses across the country that we increase our supply of domestically produced energy of all types. That includes energy from renewable sources, like wind, but it should also include more traditional energy sources like clean coal and natural gas that provide the bulk of our country's energy.

We need to take advantage of our own natural resources to reduce our reliance on foreign oil. Yet the bill we consider today does nothing to support clean coal to liquid fuels. This country has a 240-year supply of coal that could be used to replace some of the imported oil we currently use for transportation fuel. Coal provides over one-half of our Nation's electricity and well over 95 percent of the power in my State of West Virginia.

□ 1230

Where is it in this bill? This is the "no energy" energy bill. Clean coal has the potential to be a major part of the solution in reducing our reliance on foreign oil through many technologies, among those, coal-to-liquid.

Besides being a major coal producer, my State of West Virginia also has a large oil and gas business and a large chemical industry that relies on natural gas as a feedstock. This bill's provisions will likely delay or reduce access to a significant portion of our natural gas reserves.

Increasing natural gas prices will drive up the cost of chemical manufacturing and cost more workers in this industry their jobs. An economist in my local paper this morning said, "The fewer lands open for drilling, the higher the price for natural gas. It's not a good thing for consumers."

It simply defies logic that this House, on one hand, can condemn the high cost of energy price at the pump, heating and cooling, while on the other hand refuse to act on clean coal legislation, coal liquefaction, and cut off access to domestic oil shale and natural gas.

If the new direction in domestic policy means turning our back on domestic coal or turning off half our lights and if it means cutting off our access to our own natural gas and oil shale so we can be held hostage by foreign countries for energy or if it turns out half the lights or 95 percent of the lights in my State of West Virginia, I want no part of it.

I urge my colleagues to reject this energy legislation.

Mr. MICA. Might I inquire again about the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1 minute and the right to close.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, on the issue of capacity expansion process, studies have shown that improving traffic flow at more than 200 identified bottlenecks would reduce carbon emissions by as much as 77 percent. That's that single lane.

On the bridge in Massachusetts, the Democrats were all in favor of taking down a 100-year old bridge and replacing it. We are replacing that bridge. That new bridge will be in place. Now they found out that the old bridge will block the liquified natural gas tankers from going up. They wanted that bridge removed. That bridge is still going to be there and blocking their natural gas from getting to where it needs to go. Unbelievable.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman fully knows the issue at hand in Massachusetts. The entire Massachusetts delegation knows their State better than we here in this body.

As for the capacity issue, that amendment was never offered.

Our bill does keep the lights on, but with photovoltaic, energy efficient lighting, compact fluorescents. To reduce the cost, save the use of coal so that it can be directed to more important industrial purposes like producing steel, we do have an energy conservation and energy-creating program that we bring to the floor in our portion of this legislation.

I was actually out this morning myself helping the energy issue, consuming 900 calories on the seat of a bicycle, rather than consuming a gallon of gasoline in my car.

In fact, if we all did that, we could save that eight barrels of oil a year, consume 86,000 calories on the seat of a bicycle and convert from a hydrocarbon economy to the carbohydrate economy.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time allotted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me first commend Speaker PELOSI for orchestrating an incredibly complex set of provisions across the full spectrum of issues and committees. It was a masterful achievement, and we are all in her debt.